

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated March 13, 2006. A Petition for Extension of Time (one month) and the fee therefor are enclosed.

Applicant's attorneys appreciate the Examiner's thorough search and examination of the present patent application.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-16, 18 and 20-36 are pending in this application. All claims were rejected.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-16, 18 and 20-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,178,130 to Kaiya ("Kaiya") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,615 to Matumoto ("Matumoto"). Additionally, claims 1, 18, 22, 26 and 30 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of Kaiya.

Preliminarily, and responsive to the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer obviates the same.

Substantively, and in response to the rejection of the claims over the combined teachings of Kaiya and Matumoto, it is noted that a common feature in each of the independent claims in the application is that the timing signal generation circuit is provided in a location prior to the imaging apparatus. For example, in claim 1, the timing signal generation circuit is "incorporated in the connector" This is also true of the other independent claims, including claims 18, 22, 26, 30 and newly presented claim 37.

Turning to the primary reference, Kaiya does not disclose such a feature. In fact, the Office Action concedes as much. It is noted that the last paragraph of the Office Action on page 4 states: "A timing signal generation circuit, incorporated in the imaging apparatus..." (emphasis added). Thus, the Office Action recognizes and, in fact, the primary reference discloses, a timing signal generation circuit in the imaging apparatus, but the claims herein have a differently located generation circuit, which distinguishes the invention over the prior art. And, of course, applicant is quite familiar with the primary reference, as it is co-assigned with the present application.

Thus, the primary prior art teaches no more than that in a parent/child endoscope pair, a synchronizing signal can be generated in the CCU at the parent side and that signal is inputted to

a corresponding CCU at the child side, in order to synchronize the operations between the parent and child devices.

The Office Action relies on the secondary reference for providing a teaching of compensation over a transmission line. However, Matumoto describes nothing but varying the phase of the CDS (sampling) circuit, so as to be inputted to the video signal processing means. The combined teachings of these references do not teach that feature of the invention in the independent claims herein described above.

To recapitulate, in the present claims, the sampling circuit in the connector performs the sampling and the phase of the drive signal is pre-adjusted so that the phase of the image pick-up signal that is inputted to the video signal processing circuit may be kept constant. As a result, it becomes unnecessary to adjust the processing timing at the site of the signal processing circuit. Hence, it is possible to simplify the circuits in the video signal processing unit, achieving cost reductions based on the unique component placement defined in the independent claims of the present application.

The remaining claims in the application are all dependent from one or the other of the aforementioned independent claims and include their limitations. These claims also include further features which distance them even more apart from the prior art. Accordingly, all of the claims are submitted to be patentable thereover.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on July 13, 2006

Max Moskowitz

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

July 13, 2006

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

MAX MOSKOWITZ

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700